

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/828,490	04/20/2004	Randell Wayne Dickey	2003B061/2 7102	
759	90 05/03/2006		EXAM	INER
ExxonMobil Chemical Company			LU, C CAIXIA	
Law Technology P.O. Box 2149			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Baytown, TX 77522-2149			1713	
			DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/828,490	DICKEY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Caixia Lu	1713
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the trill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-93 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-93 is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-93 are subject to restriction and/or expressions. 	n from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original than the correction of the correction of the original than the correction of the correcti	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been receiv (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/9/05&4/20/04.	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-15, 32-45, 47-60, and 62-93, drawn to a polymerization process, classified in class 526, subclass 160.
 - II. Claims 16-31, 46, and 61, drawn to a polymer product, classified in class526, subclass 348.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the polymer can be prepared in a process wherein the antistatic agent is absent.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1713

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: various methods of polymerization. The species are independent or distinct because are not obvious variations among themselves.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. During a telephone conversation with Attorney Shawn Foster on April 19, 2006 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of I wherein in the polymerization process, the catalyst species (a) is a metallocene complex supported

Art Unit: 1713

on a fluoridized silica, the monomer species (b) is propylene and ethylene, and the antistatic agent species (c) is Stadis®425, claims 1-15. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. It is understood that claims 1-15 are preliminarily elected to lessen the burden of the initial examination, the rest of the process claims will be rejoined with claims 1-15 upon allowance if those claims are amended within the scope claims 1-15. Claims 16-93 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 10. Claims 1-8 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jensen et al. (US 2005/159300) and McDaniel et al. (US 6,833,338) independently.

Jenson's Example 5 on page 27 demonstrates an ethylene polymerization process in the presence a metallocene catalyst supported on a fluorided silica-alumina, wherein a small amount of antistatic agent of Stadis®450 (<5 ppm relative to diluent) is used to prevent static buildup in the reactor. Jenson's teaching meets the limitation of the instant claims.

McDaniel's Example 9 demonstrates an ethylene polymerization process in the presence a metallocene catalyst supported on a fluorided silica-alumina, a scavenger such as triethylaluminum, and a small amount of antistatic agent such as Stadis®450 (<5 ppm relative to diluent) (col. 26, line 30 to col. 27, line 7). McDaniel's teaching meets the limitation of the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen et al. (US 2005/159300) and McDaniel et al. (US 6,833,338) independently.

Jenson and McDaniel's teaching is relied upon as shown above. While the cited prior art does not expressly teach the antistatic agent to be in the range of 0.3 to 0.8 ppm based on the weight of the monomer, the cited prior art does teach the amount of antistatic agent of Stadis 450 to be <5 ppm relative to diluent to prevent static buildup.

Art Unit: 1713

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to employ Jenson or McDaniel's teaching to minimize amount of antistatic agent in the polymerization process and thus lower the cost and prevent deterioration of the polymer mechanical properties and in the absence of any showing of criticality and unexpected results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful and the matter is urgent, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571) 272-1114. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Caixía Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner